Scott. II 29- 27.6.14- 25-11-24.

Public (1926) Department.

Nil S SERIES.

G.O. No. 590

DATED 14-6-26

[Despatch Abstract.]

Riots and disturbances.

1- Karachi - Hartal on 8th - Parties withdrawn &
[illegible] - Its in Cmd.
[illegible] Secretariat & Cmd. Secretariat
- Treasury

To

His Excellency the Governor-in-Council,
Fort St. George,
MADRAS.

CURRENT NO.
6183
PUBLIC

(Through the Hon'ble the Law-Member of the Government of Madras, Madras).

May it please your Excellency,

The humble memorial of the Panchachar Lingayats of Uttangi and other villages of the Bellary District, most respectfully showeth:-

1. That they represent the 'Panchachar' Community residing in Uttangi, Ittigi and other villages in the Western Taluks of the Bellary District.

2. That among the 'Lingayats' in India, there are five great 'Mutts'. and 'Ujjini' Mutt situate in the Kudligi Taluk in the Bellary District is one of them. All people of the 'Lingayat' sect are bound to pay homage to those Mutts. They are presided over by "Gurus" who are from time -- immemorial ~~are~~ previleged to wear all the sacred insignia of Gurushipp during their tours and marches and such previleges have been for a long time recognised in their case by the Governments of the day. These processional marches equipped with the paraphernalia of spiritual "Gurus" cannot be ~~restored~~ to by all and sundry, however estimable they may be in the eyes of a few; In the Bellary District, the "Ujjini Swami" is the only "spiritual" Guru who is entitled to these honours and previleges at the hands of the Lingayat Community. The Memorialists are the staunch disciples of the said "Ujjini" Mutt.

3. That about 40 years ago, there arose in "Ujjini" a dissenting sect of Lingayats now commonly called "Sadar" or "Sadhu" Lingayats. A Sadar follower, Gurupadappa was set up against the Guru of the "Ujjini" Mutt who picked up

a small following and founded a Mutt of what is known as "Tarla Bala Mutt" in the Mysore Province in opposition to the "Ujjini" Guru in the Bellary District. This rival "Mutt" has not got any peculiar tents of its own.

4. That this rival "Sadar" Guru of the new "Tarla Bala Mutt" has been ever since striving his utmost to establish his status as the "Guru" by dint of Executive and Judicial authority. With this object in view, the alleged "Guru" started a procession a long time ago from his Mutt in the Mysore Province and reached a small -- village close to "Uttangi" village in the Hadagalli Taluk. When he and his followers attempted to proceed through the "Uttangi" village with the paraphernalia of a "Guru", they were opposed by the members of the much larger sect known as the "Panchachar" Sect.

5. It may incidentally be observed that the "Panchachar" Sect very largely predominates over the "Sadhu sect" in numbers in the Bellary District, especially in the village of Uttangi.

5. That since the year 1890, several attempts have been made by the "Guru" and his followers to secure a "license" from the Police and the Magistrate; but all of them have proved abortive. Applications for a license for the procession have been repeatedly filed out have been refused; sometimes granted and revoked on further -- consideration, and from time to time, the Section 144 and Section 107, Criminal Procedure Code, have been freely and frequently used to prevent such processions; the main ground being that the procession, if permitted, would be certainly opposed by the people of the "Panchachar" Sect and that serious riot and copious bloodshed would be the inevitable result of the same.

6. That during all this long time, the applications

made by the "Sadar" Guru have always been in the end fruitless "because the Magistrate and the Police have always quite rightly held, that they were primarily concerned with the maintenance of the peace and that it was no business of theirs to declare or establish the status of the "Sadar" Guru.

7. That resort also was had to Civil Courts: Suits were filed in the Civil Courts for the declaration of the "Sadar" Swami's" status as a Guru. The final order of the Civil Court is contained in the Judgment of the High Court in the Second Appeals Nos. 2496 and 2497 of 1913, wherein it declined to grant any such relief but merely declared his right to process through the streets as any other ordinary citizen.

8. That the first attempt of the "Sadar Swami" to go in procession with the paraphernalia pertaining to a "Guru" was disallowed by the then Collector of Bellary, R. Sewell in 1890; From that time till about 1910, the "Sadar" Guru used to visit the village like any ordinary citizen without any paraphernalia to which he is now -- making pretensions. (Vide Taluk Magistrate's order, dated 15-4-1916).

9. That, about the year 1907 the said "Sadar" Guru repeatedly attempted to go in procession which he was -- prohibited from doing by the Executive authorities. In the year 1910, the then District Magistrate ordered that if he claimed a right to move in procession through any village of the Bellary District with the insignia of a 'Guru' and if his claim was resisted, he should establish his right as such in a Civil Court of competent jurisdiction. With this object in view, the said 'Guru' filed O.S.No. 864 of 1910 in the Court of the District Munsif of Hospet for a decree declaring his right to move in procession through certain villages in the Western Taluks in Bellary District with certain fourteen emblems specified hereunder pertaining

to a Guru mentioned therein. The District Munsif granted the relief prayed for, but in appeals A.S.No. 91 and 101 of 1912, the District Judge set aside the decree of the District Munsif and matter was finally disposed of by the High Court in the second appeals Nos. 2496 and 2497 of 1913; The District Judge Mr. W.W. Phillips, now Mr. Justice Phillips observed in para 5 of his judgment in appeal "the whole purpose of the suit as is disclosed by the pleadings and evidence adduced on both sides is undoubtedly to establish the respondent's status as a 'Guru' and his right to adopt a certain ritual and a declaration of his right which he possesses with the other members of the public to go in procession through the public streets will hardly satisfy his aspirations, nor has he proved that such right has been interfered with . . . . . Exhibit VIII shows that in 1889 respondent's predecessor was prohibited by the District Magistrate by using his insignia in Ujjini and it would appear that he is now trying to extend his sphere of -- influence under judicial authority . . . . I find there is no jurisdiction for the grant of injunction." The High Court in the Second appeal above referred to found as follows:- "We think it desirable, however, that the Plaintiff's (Sadar Guru's) title as citizen-subject of His Majesty (and not to go as a real or alleged Guru or in any other religious capacity) to go in procession with any harmless paraphernalia should be declared in this suit. Though we agree with the learned District Judge that no injunction need be -- granted, we shall therefore give a decree for plaintiff -- declaring that he is entitled like any other member of the general public to move in procession through all the public streets within the jurisdiction of the District Munsif with any accompaniments, subject always to such directions as the Magistrate may lawfully give to prevent obstacles of the thoroughfares and breaches of public peace." The Decree of the High Court was passed on the 1st of September 1915.

10. That subsequent to this decree, the attempts made by the said Swami to move in a procession with certain symbols of a Guru were prohibited by the Taluk Magistrates of Hadagalli Taluk in the years 1916, 1917 and 1918. In 1918, the Deputy Superintendent granted his license for the -- procession in the first instance, which was afterwards cancelled by him on further consideration.

11. That on 13-3-1919 and also on 13-5-1919, the then District Magistrate, Mr. J.I. Smith refused permission for a procession of the 'Sadar' Guru in the following terms:- "The undersigned cannot interfere with the orders already passed by his predecessor in regard to the procession noted above".

12. That renewed efforts were made by the same 'Swami' to secure a license in 1920 before the then District Magistrate, Mr. A.F.G. Moscardie. In his proceddings dated the 23-4-1920, the District Magistrate while refusing the -- license observed as follows:- "To decide whether the petitioners are 'Gurus', if so, whether they are entitled to make any procession and what sort of procession would be going far beyond the competency of any Magistrate"

"The attempt to issue license this breaks down, as the conditions are the essential part of such a license and I cannot know what the conditions should be. No license will be issued and the parties are advised not to do anything which may occasion a breach of the peace."

13. That when fresh attempts were made in the year 1921 towards the same procession, the District Magistrate on or about 5-5-1921 issued a prohibition-order restraining the same and similar orders were passed by the Subordinate Magistrates also In the same connection Mr. Moscardie made a reference to the Government in the same year -- recommending that permanent and authoritative orders should be passed by them prohibiting the procession in question

generally in future.

14. That the matter was raked up again before the succeeding District Magistrate, Mr. Molony in 1922 in Crl: Mis: Petition No. 1 of 1922, who, in his order dated the 28th January 1922, while prohibiting the procession found as follows:-

"All that the Courts have decided is that the 'Swami' has a right like every one else to go through the 'public' streets. This does not confer on him the right to go about with paraphernalia considered by others to be injurious to their feelings. At present, as it appears to me, I could only secure his passage with his paraphernalia at the probable cost of bloodshed".

"My sole preoccupation is to prevent a riot and so long as in my opinion the procession is likely to provoke a riot; so long I shall continue to prohibit it".

15. That the matter was not pursued in the year 1923; on the 16th January 1924, the 'Swami' filed a petition -- before the then District Magistrate through his Counsel, Mr. C.L. Thornton, that he might be permitted to move in -- procession like any other member of the general public to enable him to enjoy his rights as a citizen of the Empire in accordance with the decree of the High Court in the second appeals already noted. It may be observed that the Swami in the petition never prayed that he should be allowed to process with the insignia of a 'Guru'.

16. That the District Magistrate, thereupon, in his proceddings D.Dis. C. 1808/24-H2- dated the 10th October 1924, while conceding that the 'Sadar' 'Swami's' status as a Guru and his right to bear the insignia of a 'Guru' could be validly recognised only by the King, he wrongly arrogated to himself the position of a local representative of the King in the District and stated that in that capacity he recognised the 'Sadar' Guru as a Guru". He also held in the same proceed-

ings that, as the Collector, he was competent to recognise the Sadar Guru's right to use certain insignia and appealed to the contending parties to settle the question of the insignia among themselves failing which he would do so himself.

17. That again on 18-2-1925, the 'Swami' put in a second petition through the same Counsel praying that the insignia which he had to carry might be settled and also that the Deputy Superintendent of Police might be directed to issue the requisite license under S. 30 of the Indian Police Act V of 1861.

18. That on 6-3-1925. only two persons of the 'Panchachar' Sect were present at the time of the hearing of the petition. They were asked by the District Magistrate whether they would oppose the procession; they stated that they objected to the 'Sadar Swami' going in procession with the insignia of a Guru, as it would be injurious to the feelings of the members of their own Panchachar' sect. The Collector replied that he had already recognised him as a 'Guru' and the only question outstanding was to settle the question of his insignia. Then the Panchachars said that the District Magistrate might act as he pleased and suggested that the other -- important leaders should be communicated with. Then their signatures to a piece of paper containing same thing written in English were taken. They emphatically deny the Panchachar representatives ever consented to the proposal of the Collector in the matter.

19. That thereupon the District Magistrate in his proceedings D.Dis. C. 1036/25/A-2-1925 6-3-1925 permitted the Swami to go in procession through the village of Uttangi with certain insignia specified by him and mentioned hereunder along a certain route prescribed by him on a date to be fixed by him.

Copy at Mk 10-13 / G.O. 360 Pub 15.4.75

20. That the petitioners then appealed to the Government who in their order G.O.No. Mis. 360 Public Department dated the 19th April 1925 were pleased to observe as follows - "The Government do not concern themselves with questions of religious rites and the insignia of Gurus. At the same time, they cannot interfere with the discretion of the District Magistrate as to the maintenance of peace and order in his District".

(12)

21. That, then the ~~counter-petitioner~~ P.S. 'Sadar Swami' P.S. applied to the District Superintendent of Police for a license under Section 30 of the Indian Police to be allowed to go in procession, through the streets of "Uttangi" with certain emblems claimed by them and mentioned hereunder.

22. That the District Superintendent of Police after hearing the Vakils on both sides and while prohibiting the use of certain emblems by the ~~counter-petitioner~~ 'Sadar Swami' granted a license on or about 3-7-1925 permitting the ~~counter-petitioner~~ P.S. Swami P.S. to go in procession with certain other emblems after giving seven days clear notice of his date of procession.

23. That the 'Sadar Swami' being dissatisfied with the said order appealed to the District Magistrate, who however declined to interfere with the discretion of the District Superintendent of Police. In his proceedings dated the 28th September 1925, the District Magistrate was pleased to observe "I do not think it is open to a Collector or a District Magistrate to adjudicate on the claims of persons to wear or travel about with insignia of spiritual supremacy, or to define the proper insignia to be adopted by religious functionaries on the occasion of processions."

24. That, thereupon, the 'Sadar Swami' notified his intention to the District Superintendent of Police to carry on the procession on the 19th instant under the conditions prescribed by the said Officer in his proceedings dated

3-7-1925 and already referred to ~~above~~. The District Superintendent thereupon referred the matter to the Deputy Superintendent of Police to enquire and report asto whether there would be any opposition from the petitioners' party to the proposed procession under the prescribed conditions and whether there would be any likelihood of the breach of the peace. The petitioners' party afterwards appeared before the Deputy Superintendent and stated their objections to the contemplated procession and also hinted that there was every likelihood of the breach of the peace, if it should be permitted.

25. That the petitioners then approached the District Superintendent with a petition that in view of the likelihhod of the breach of the peace and possible riot and bloodshed, the "Swami" might be prohibited from wearing ~~add~~ the 14 emblems claimed by the ~~counter-petitioners~~ Sadar Swami. The said officer declined to reconsider the order already passed by him on 3-7-1925 and ~~is now~~ has determined to carry it at any cost on the 19th ~~instant~~ October and with that object mobilized a strong police force of about 100 police -- constables, both reserve and local, a number of Police Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors headed by the Deputy Superintendent to force the procession against the wishes of the majority of the "Panchachar" people residing at Uttangi and elsewhere.

26. That out of the emblems claimed by the ~~counter-petitioner~~ Sadar Swami as pertaining to a Guru and denied by the -- petitioners, the District Superintendent of Police allowed the emblems (i) the palanquin, (ii) Mena, (iii) Elephants, (iv) Horses, (v) and Camels, (vi) Pipes and drums and Red umbrellas and out of the emblems disallowed by the District Superintendent (i) Nandi Dwajam, (ii) Swetha Chathram (white umbrella), (iii) Simha Lalatam, (iv) Vyasa Hastam, (v) Cross-palanquin, (vi) Pancha Kalasam, (vii) Chalavadi Ghanta, (viii) Recital of Kudugas were never claimed by the ~~counter-petitioner~~. Sadar Swami

27. That the Decree of the High Court in Second Appeals Nos. 2496 and 2497/13, declined to declare the ~~counter-petitioner's~~ Sadar Swami's right to go in procession as a real or alleged Guru or in any other religious capacity, with the 'fourteen' emblems claimed by him, but only allowed him to process as a citizen-subject of His Majesty with any 'harmless' paraphernalia. The Police and the Magistracy have been systematically and persistently prohibiting the ~~petitioners~~ 'Sadar Swami' to go in procession as a Guru with the emblems claimed by him ever since 1890.

28. That the proposed procession with the emblems allowed by the District Superintendent was certainly -- expected to be opposed by the Panchachar Community to which the memorialists belong and was very likely to cause a serious breach of the peace and possible bloodshed. The District Executive Officers have hitherto distinctly and expressly found so in their numerous orders dating from even the year 1890.

29. That the proposed procession of the Sadar Swami with the paraphernalia of a 'Guru' allowed by the District Superintendent was highly repugnant, injurious and offensive to the feelings of the petitioner's -- community which abound in numbers in the Western Taluks, especially in the village of Uttangi in question. There are only 30 houses of Sadar Community in the village in which the Sadar Swami claims to go in procession while there are about 250 houses of the 'rival' Panchachar community. The proposed procession was an attempt to annoy and to offend the feelings of the whole of the Panchachar Community in the whole of the Western Taluks of the Bellary District. Among the Lingayat population in the said taluks only 5 per cent of it belong to the Sadar sect and the remaining 95 per cent to the Panchachar sect. The intended procession was a gross insult to the head of the Ujjini Mutt, one of the well recognised Mutts in

India as the 'Sadar' Swami unwarrantedly assumes the style and title of the head of the Ujjini Mutt (Ujjini Saddarma Simhasanathipa) and is proclaimed as such during the processions.

30. That the emblems permitted by the District Superintendent of Police have been from outset asserted by the 'Sadar Swami' and denied by the petitioners. The attempts so far of the 'Sadar Swami' to establish his right to the said emblems have proved abortive. The civil courts, the Magistracy and the Police have been steadily prohibiting the said Swami from wearing them. The fight round these 14 emblems has been raging for more than 30 years and the District Superintendent of Police in effect was seeking to establish the ~~counter-petitioner's~~ Sadar Swami's right to the status of a Guru at the point of the bayonet and by dint of the Police force.

31. That, under these circumstances the memorialists approached the District Magistrate of Bellary on the 16th of October last, with a petition under Sec. 144 Crl. Pro: Code. praying that the 'Sadar Swami' might be prohibited from going in procession through the village of Uttangi in the Hadagalli Taluk with any of the emblems pertaining to a 'Guru' claimed by him as a real or supposed Guru or in any other religious capacity but the District Magistrate merely forwarded it for disposal to the Sub-Divisional Magistrate at Hospet without passing any orders thereon.

32. That, thereupon, the petitioner's vakil Mr. N. Narayana Rao met the joint Magistrate at Hospet on the next day the 17th and requested him by a petition to stop the procession under Sec. 144 Crl: Pro: Code: as a serious breach of the peace was apprehended: The Joint-Magistrate was pleased to observe that if there would be any likelihood of the breach of the peace, he would at once issue an order under Sec. 144 Crl: Pro: Code: to stop the procession and that he would not allow any bloodshed there.

He further expressed that he would go to Uttangi on the 18th and send for the parties to arrange for a compromise and see that the matter was smoothly settled and that orders would be passed at Uttangi on the 19th of October last.

33. That on the evening of the 18th of October the petitioner's Vakil met the Joint Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police again at Ittigi and Uttangi and renewed his request for stopping the procession but to no effect.

34. That a faithful narrative of the incidents that took place at Uttangi on the 18th, the 19th and 20th of October last is continued in the ensuing draft-petition intended to be submitted to the District Magistrate which is herewith appended.

35. That even on the evening of the 18th October, large crowds of 'Panchachars' had gathered at the outskirts of the village of Uttangi: By the morning of the 19th, thousands of people both Panchachars and 'Sadars' had collected in the streets of Uttangi in expectation of the procession. The Panchachars were determined to object to the procession before the authorities and to demonstrate to them the very strong feeling that prevailed against the proposed procession: They were all unarmed then:

36. The Joint Magistrate and the District Superintendent would not study the situation and were bent upon carrying the procession at any cost by force even at the sacrifice of life: If only the Joint-Magistrate had issued the prohibitory-order under Sec. 144 even then, everything would have ended in peace and quiet.

37. That the result was that there was 'Police problem' P.S. and the 'pelting' of stones by the populace and consequent firing by the police with terrible consequences: There have been four deaths among the Panchachars and a number of men injured among them and a few among the police.

38. That the firing was quite unjustifiable under the circumstances: and the license granted for the procession was the height of executive indiscretion. The facts narrated in the accompanying statement speak for themselves and do not require any comment.

39. That, to add insult to the injury, some 132 members of the Panchachar party have been put up for trial by the police before the Special Magistrate of Adoni for rioting, grievous hurt and for other various offences under the Indian Penal Code: and about 100 witnesses have been cited for the prosecution. The case is registered as P.R. No. 1 of 1925 on the file of the Special Magistrate of the 1st class and is posted to the 21st for enquiry.

40. That this prosecution is highly inexpedient and undesirable in the circumstances of the case. This is sure to aggravate the acute communal feelings already prevailing between the two rival sects in the District

41. That the memorialists were actuated by their religious feelings in objecting to the procession of the 'Sadar' Swami: as the attempted procession was a gross-insult to their religion.

42. That the memorialists have already suffered much: four of them have been killed and a number have been seriously injured: and the prosecution now launched is sure to cause a lot of expense, worry, trouble and inconvenience to them:

43. That in the best interests of peace and order in the District the procession of the 'Sadar' Swami with the emblems of the Guru in question should be permanently prohibited and the prosecution is eminently a fit one for withdrawal: it would be impossible to identify the offenders in a vast assembly of 5 to 6 thousand people.

44. The Memorialists pray, therefore that permanent orders may be passed by the Government prohibiting the procession of the 'Sadar Swami' with the emblems in dispute into the villages in question and also ~~a~~ that the prosecution now launched against them may be withdrawn and also that pending the enquiry and ~~xi~~ disposal of this petition the proceedings in the case on the file of the Special Magistrate may be stayed.

For which act of kindness, the memorialists shall ever pray for your Excellency's long life and --. prosperity.

They beg to remain,
Your Excellency's most
obedient servants,

P. Swaklao
Vakil for the
petitioners
15/12/25

M. M. L. Doraiswamy Pillai

P. Uddamaiya. B.A. BL.
Municipal Councillor.

15 15

Pol. Dept.

Endt. 6163-1.
18-12-35.

Complt. Dispute between Panchachary & Sadachary of Uthangi & other villages. Petition from Panchachary dt. 15.12.35.

Dpd. with enclosures 24/12

Referred to the D.M. Bellary for early remarks.
18/12/35.

Endn.
17.12.35.
C.C.
17/12/35

To the D.M. Bellary
(Endt. & Cy. & enclosures may be returned with reply)

(A Cy. only to be submitted for page)

pages 1 + 2 Cf should be retained but Copy of it should be sent along with other pages of Cf

Forwarded to the C.S. If these authorities can be conferred to establish friendly relations it would be very advantageous. Sent for Sir

(1) 16/12/25

16/12

The Hon'ble Sir C.P.Ramaswami Ayyar, K.C.I.E.,

Law Member to the Government of Madras,

Fort St. George, Madras.

CURRENT NO.
6162
PUBLIC

Dear Sir,

The Uttangi rioting case in which some 132 members of the Panchachars community have been charged for rioting etc., is posted to the 21st instant for hearing before the Special Magistrate at Bellary.

The case is, in my opinion, preeminently a suitable one for withdrawal for more than one reason. This prosecution would only tend to accentuate the tension of feeling already existing between the Sadar and the Panchachars sects of the Lingayat communities. I believe there is a fair chance of a compromise of the differences in question, if sufficient time is granted. * I shall try my best to effect a settlement, if only I am allowed sufficient time. The Panchachars have already suffered badly by 4 persons having been killed among them and a number of others injured. In my humble opinion the Government cannot absolve themselves entirely from responsibility for this unfortunate event.

Hence I request you will be good enough to direct the stay of proceedings in the case to some date after the middle of January to enable me to try for a settlement between the parties.

I have the honour to remain,

Dear Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

16/12/25

A Ranganathan

17 Postage

Secret. No. 6162-I dt 17.12.2

Riots, Hungi,

Bellary.

Letter dt 16.12.3 from

MR Rly A. Ranganathan

Referred to the

D M, Bellary, for

necessary Remarks. The

Court would consider

it was a trivial affair.

if a Compromise

could be effected

To avoid any further

trouble.

17/12/2

17/12/2

To The D M, Bellary

(Copy of the above)

17/12/2

CONFIDENTIAL.

C.No. 5628-25-A-2.

Bellary Collector's Office,

Dated 2nd January 1926.

CURRENT NO.
0044
PUBLIC

From

Khan Bahadur M. Bazl-ul-lah Saheb Bahadur C.I.E., C.B.E.,
District Magistrate, BELLARY.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St. George, MADRAS.

Sir,

Subject:- Uttangi - Dispute between Panchachars and Sadars - Letter from M.R.Ry., A. Ranganadham Mudaliar, M.L.C., and petition from M.R.Ry., P. Sivarao, M.L.C, on behalf of the Panchachars - Report submitted.

I return herewith Mr. A. Ranganadham Mudaliar's letter dated 16-12-1925 and the petition dated 15-12-1925 from Mr. P. Siva Rao, M.L.C., on behalf of the Panchachar Lingayats of Uttangi, which were referred to me for remarks in Government Endorsements Nos 6162-1 and 6163-1 -- dated 17th and 18th December respectively.

As both communications relate to the same subject, I deal with them together.

Whereas Mr. Ranganadham makes the comparatively modest suggestion that the proceedings in the Uttangi rioting case might be stayed to give him some time to try and compose the differences between the two rival sects and then, presumably, to approach Government with a request for a withdrawal of the case, the petition presented by Mr. Siva Rao contains two prima facie impossible requests:- (1), that -- the procession of the Sadar Guru should be permanantly prohibited and (2) that the charge sheet laid by the Police -- should be unconditionally withdrawn. To this petition is appended a draft of another petition which is said to have

been intended to be submitted to me. No such petition was, however, actually submitted. This draft petition is said to contain a faithful narrative of the events that took place at Uttangi. The District Superintendent of Police, who was present on the spot and is personally aware of what took place at Uttangi, tells me that, far from being a faithful narrative, the document is inaccurate in places and grossly false in others.

3 Paras 1 to 2[illegible] of Mr. P. Siva Rao's petition give a history of the long standing dispute between the two sects and are fairly accurate, except for the innuendo contained in the last two sentences of paragraph 18. As stated in para 3 of my letter dated 20th October, 1925, the two Panchachar representatives referred to therein expressed themselves agreeable to the proposals made by Mr. Duff, but stated that they could not speak for other important leaders who should be consulted. It was certainly not the case, as the petition seems to suggest, that Mr. Duff extorted their unwilling signatures to a statement in English recorded by him.

4 As regards paras 22 to 28, the District Superintendent of Police states that his license, which was issued in July 1925, prohibited the use of all insignia objected to by Mr. Siva Rao on behalf of the Panchachars and that Mr. Siva Rao expressed himself perfectly satisfied with it. When later, the Sadars elected to take the procession without any of the insignia objected to, Mr. P. Siva Rao requested him to reconsider the terms of his license, but he could not comply with the request as it amounted to a denial of all rights of procession with or without insignia to the Sadars. The District Superintendent of Police assures me that at no stage of the controversy since 1891, did the Panchachars object to any emblem or insignia which were allowed by him in his license. Paragraphs 25, 26 and 28 contain inaccurate statements and only show that the Panchachars ---

20

objected to the procession with or without insignia and were determined to obstruct it. In this connection, attention is invited to paragraphs 5 and 6 of my letter dated 25th October, 1925.

PP 24-25 of originals in Ejo. 1090 Pub/11.11.25 (X)

PP 12-13 ante

5 As regards paragraphs 35 to 38, I would refer Government to paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of my letter dated 25th October, 1925. As stated therein, the attack on the Police was wanton and unprovoked. The casualties were small considering the situation, and but for the timely protection afforded by the Police, the Sadar Guru and many of his followers would have been killed.

PP 24-26 of originals in Ejo. 1090 Pub 11.11.25 (X)

P. 13 ante — 6 Para 40 --- I fail to see how the prosecution of persons who openly defied the law and committed most serious offences against the public tranquility is "highly inexpedient and undesirable." On the other hand, I consider that if the case is withdrawn and the offenders allowed to go scot free, it would render the maintenance of law and order a matter of great difficulty. The request for a permanant prohibition of the Sadar Guru's procession cannot be considered, as it would amount to a denial to a minority of its ordinary rights and of necessary protection in the lawful exercise of such rights.

7 The only aspect of the matter which deserves some consideration is the suggestion in Mr. Ranganadham's letter, that the prosecution would tend to accentuate the tension already existing between the two sects. The matter has been in dispute for an indefinite period and it is high time that a spirit of moderation and compromise should manifest itself. If therefore there was any prospect of a genuine compromise which would end this long standing feud, there might be some justification for considering the suggestion for a withdrawal of the case. But, at present, I see no such prospect and I fear Mr. Ranganadham is far too sanguine. It might be

possible to make a show of a compromise for the purpose of obtaining a withdrawal of the case; but such a make-believe is worse than useless and I would give no credit to any report or assurance of a compromise unless it is supported by some practical and indubitable proof of a genuine compromise. It seems to me that in the circumstances of the case, the only crucial test of the accomplishment of such a compromise is the peaceful conduct of the Sadar procession through the Uttangi Village. Not until this takes place would I believe that a real compromise has actually been effected.

6 In case Government is inclined to entertain any proposal for a withdrawal of the case, I would suggest as a condition precedent to a favourable consideration of the proposal, that the Panchachars, who flouted the authority of Government, should atone for their lawless conduct by allowing the Sadar Guru to go in procession peacefully through Uttangi in accordance with the terms of the license issued by the District Superintendent of Police. This would furnish proof of a real compromise between the two sects, and at the same time amount to a vindication of the law.

9 The District Superintendent of Police is opposed to any withdrawal and I think rightly.

10 The case stands adjourned to the 11th instant, some of the accused having been absent on the 22nd December.

A.D. 2-1-26.

District Magistrate.

Three drafts

Pub 24

Memo No 6163-2 dt 7-1-1926

Dispute between Pamba chary & Yadavs —

Letter from D.M, Bellary, C. No. 5628-25.A.2 dt 2-1-26.

P. 18-21 dt 24-1-26

The Govt agree with the D.M, in ~~his remarks as to the propriety of a Com-promise between the parties and they see no reason at present to direct a with-drawal of the case now pending against the Pasechanakars.~~

D.T.O

7-1-26

that the proposal to withdraw the Prosecution should not be considered ~~exempt~~ subject to the notice & until the conditions mentioned by him in Para 8 of his letter is realised.

7/1/26.

all 7.1.26

To The D.M, Bellary

7 JAN 1926

Memo. No. 6163-3 dt. 7.1.1926

Dispute between Panchachary & Sadasiva

II

Petition dt. 15.12.25 filed by V.K.Ry P. Siva Rao Avl., vice, on behalf of Panchachary.

PK 1-14 c.f.

D-note 7/1

The Govt. are not prepared & unable to Comply with the requests in the petition.

Para 44, p. 14 c.f.

Govt 7.1.26

VK 7.1.26

V.K.Ry P. Siva Rao

Forwarded to me.
The Collr. may see this
in the D.M. A will appear
in the D.M. has been visited with
for my order & he
for the discretion he will deal with
8/1/26. CBR 29

CURRENT NO.
0155
PUBLIC

To,

His Excellency the Governor-in-Council

Fort St., George,

MADRAS.

CURRENT NO.
0094
JUDICIAL A

Recd 11/1/26

May it please your Excellency.

The 'Panchachar' residents of the village of Uttangi in the Hadagalli Taluk, in the Bellary District most humbly beg to submit as follows:-

(1) That they filed a petition for the withdrawal of the prosecution in the rioting-case launched against them in P.R. No. 20 of 1925 on the file of the Deputy-Magistrate of Adoni and in connection therewith the reports of the District authoritieshave now been called for;

(2) That they acted under a religious impulse and most sincerely regret for their action in having opposed the procession fixed for the 19th of October last.

(3) That they unconditionally and whole heartedly undertake and promise not to oppose the carrying on of the procession with the emblems permitted in the license by the District Supertendent of Police and they also undertakestrictly to abide by the conditions and terms of the said license. They will also co-operate with the authoritiesin the conduct of the procession on those terms.

They pray, therefore, that under the circumstances

~~Pet~~ 25 25

the prosecution against them may be ordered to be withdrawn.

They beg to remain,

Your Excellency's

humble and obedient servants,

6/1/26
Bellamy

~~[illegible]~~

P. Smith Rao.
Va ice for the victims
8/1/26

MWV/15-1-26.

Public Department

26

Please treat this as Special.

Memo. No. 6163-5 dt. 15.1.26

Dispute between Panchachars and Sadars — Petition dt. 6.1.192 from M.R.Ry. P. Siva Rao Avl., M.L.C., on behalf of Panchachars — Continuation of Memo. No. 6163-2 dt. 7.1.1926, to the D.M., Bellary.

Cr. 15/1/26

M 24-25 CF

22 C.F.

A copy of the petition dt. 6.1.1926 from M.R.Ry. P. Siva Rao Avl., M.L.C. on behalf of Panchachars is forwarded to the D.M., Bellary.

M 24-25 Cf

To 15/1 RS

The D.M., Bellary

(with copy of petition at pp. 24-25 Cf.)

Real 16/1/26.

JWR 12/1/26.

AC 15/1/26

Initialled with notes on 15/1/26

In the High Court of Judicature at Madras

Thursday, the sixth day of MAY

One Thousand Nine hundred and twenty six.

Present:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Waller,
a n d
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Madhavan Nair

Criminal Mis. Petition No. 212 of 1926.

1. Siva Nagappa.
2. Gudekota Karebasappa.
3. Nandihalli Mahadevappa.
4. Gaddi Thinthappa.
5. Sanabhogara Mallappa.
6. Parpathyagara Basalingappa.
7. Kenchangowdra Thirukappa.
8. Bettappa.
9. Kotappa.
10. Talari Bheema.
11. Hosamatada Chendrayya.
12. Adapada Veerappa.
13. Chingateri Satha Basappa.
14. Megalageri Doddakotrappa.
15. Sivalingappa.
16. Panni Thirukappa.
17. Chenna Veeranna Gowd.
18. Veeranna Gowd.
19. Hunisikatta Basappa.
20. Bennihalli Chandrappa.
21. Lingana Gowd.
22. Talakal Kotrappa.
23. Vail Veerasangappa.
24. Sanubhogara Kallappa.
25. Halappa.
26. Chenna Veerappa.
27. Chikkagowdra Mudukappa.
28. Kalakappanavara Mallappa.
29. Mudi Mallappa.
30. Marula Siddappa
31. BarikaBasiya.
32. Kadivi Mudukappa.
33. Kunta Gowdra Marai Gowd.
34. Vadra Thimmuga.
35. Pujari Basappa.
36. Chimpigara Sivarudrappa.
37. Giddimani Saranayya.
38. Kallahalli Siddanna.
39. Basavana Gowd.
40. Banakara Chennappa.
41. Chapi Kerajappa.
42. Kotra Basappa.
43. Arisikeri Siddappa.
44. Dummi Kotrayya.
45. Ganigara Gurusiddappa.
46. Chinumala Rudrappa.
47. Ganiga Rudrappa.
48. Gudaikota Cheena Karibasappa.
49. Paniappanavara Virupanna.
50. Chigiteri Gurubasappa.
51. Vali Eswarappa.
52. Matada Siddayya.
53. Chippigara Sankarappa.
54. Gurubasavana Gowd.
55. Halagappanavara doddahalappa.

56. Kori Erappa.
57. Chenna Veerana Gowd.
58. Adivi Lettappa.
59. Adivi Basappa.
60. Kanadala Basappa.
61. Chimpigeri Kotrappa Basappa.
62. Hanisichandrappa.
63. Hanisi Ajjappa.
64. Hanisi Chennabasappa.
65. Kuntamallappanavara Sanna kotrappa.
66. Pirjari Bavici.
67. Pinjari Raja.
68. Nevaru Jinnappa.
69. Angadi Basappa.
70. Dasaigowdra Lingappa.
71. Bevihalli Mookappa.
72. Bavi Rudrappa.
73. Hatapeti Patrappa.
74. Angadi Veerappa.
75. Revana Siddappa.
76. Angadi Kotrappa.
77. Sankarasetti Basappa.
78. Hadagalli Lingappa.
79. Santa Veerayya.
80. Kandagal Sangayya.
81. Kandagal Mudukayya.
82. Satra Somayya.
83. Nevura Nariguni.
84. Nichapurada Maribasappa.
85. Matur Veerabhadrappa.
86. Javili Veerayya.
87. Vombali Basappa.
88. Banakra Nagarasetti.
89. Malvi Mallappa.
90. Bavi Bettappa.
91. Kabbaji Virupanna.
92. Morigeri Mallappa.
93. Chigiteri Sankarappa.
94. Ganigala Venkappa.
95. Prasanda Basappa.
96. Angadi Chennappa.
97. Kotra basappa.
98. Gurupadappa.
99. Kuruda Siddanna.
100. Hotu Nallappa.
101. Kuruda Chennabasavana Gowd.
102. Sankarappa.
103. Boya Kantappa.
104. Amgadi Thotappa.
105. Devaramani Bettappa.
106. Gudikota Rudrappa.
107. Kalakappanavara Halagappa.
108. Chigiteri Chennabsappa.
109. Yatada Kotrabasappa.
110. Kappala Basappa.
111. Kammara Kalappa.
112. Kallukativi Karibasappa.
113. Hulikatti Kotrappa.
114. Hiregowdra Chennabasavana Gowd.
115. Sinana Gowdra Basalingappa.
116. Basappa, V.M. Varakanahalli.
117. Agasara Karayya of Malvi.

.Petitioners (Accused in C.C. No. 23 of 1926 on the file of the Court of the -- Sub Divisional Magistrate of Bellary).

29

Petition praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavits filed therewith the High Court will be pleased to issue an order directing transfer of Calendar Case No. 23 of 1926 on the file of the Court of the Sub Divisional Magistrate of Bellary to the file of some other Magistrate not subordinate to the District Magistrate of Bellary or commitment of the petitioners (accused in the said C.C. No.23 of 1926) for trial to the Court of Session of the Bellary Division.

This petition coming on for final orders on Wednesday the 21st day of April, 1926, upon perusing the petition and the affidavits filed in support thereof and the orders of the High Court dated 12-4-1926 and made herein and the order of the High Court dated --- 1-4-1926 and made in Criminal Revision Case No. 342 of 1926 and upon hearing the arguments of Mr. Nugent Grant, counsel instructed by Mr. P. Jagannadha Rao Nayudu, Attorney for the petitioners, and of Mr. V.L.Ethiraj for the Public Prosecutor on behalf of the Crown, and the case having stood over for consideration till this day, the court made the following:-

ORDER.

This is an application for the transfer of a case from the file of the Sub Divisional Magistrate of Bellary to that of some Magistrate outside the district. The case arises out of a riot which is alleged to have occurred on 19th October last. There are two -- rival sections among the local Lingayats which are known as Panchachars and Sadars. The District Superintendent of Police gave the Sadar Guru a license to go in procession through the village of Uttangi To this the Panchachars, of course, objected, but without success. -- The procession started under an escort of Police, and in the presence of the Joint and Taluk Magistrate and the District Superintendent of Police. The Panchahcars, it is alleged, had prepared themselves to offer a violent resistance and a riot ensued of so serious a character that the Police were obliged to open fire with the result that several

lives were lost. Reports on the occurrence were submitted by the Inspector-General of Police, and the District Magistrate of Bellary, to Government, who on 11th November, issued an order - on the subject in which they found that a deliberate attack had been made by the Panchacnars and that the use of fire was necessary in order to prevent greater loss of life. At the same time, they commended the action taken by all the officers concerned. - Criminal Proceedings against the Panchachars were inevitable and Government would have done well to reserve their finding on the facts and their eulogies on the officers concerned till the Courts had had their say. The Panchachars are entitled to complain that their case had been prejudged. It is quite evident what conclusions the District Magistrate has formed and the case is being tried by a Magistrate who is subordinate to him. The principal witnesses against them are the officers who on the District Magistrate's report, have been warmly commended by Government. In the circumstances, it is not surprising that the petitioners should apprehend that the Sub Divisional Magistrate will find it extremely difficult to arrive at any conclusion opposed to that already formed by his superior. We do not say that their apprehensions - are well-founded, but that does not conclude the matter. If an accused person entertains a bona fide apprehension that he will - not have a fair trial in a particular court, he is entitled to ask that he shall be tried in another Court. At the same time, it cannot be said that, in this particular instance, petitioners' -- apprehensions are entirely without justification. The case, as originally charge-sheeted was one triable by a Court of Session. Petitioners naturally expect to be committed to the Sessions, but the Police took the unusual course of applying for permission to withdraw the gravest charge. Petitioners objected and the Sub Divisional Magistrate declined to accede to their request to be - committed. They then applied to the Sessions Judge, who held that he had no power to do anything. Finally petitioners came up to this court, but Wallace J declined to interfere.

The situation is of a quite unprecedented kind. As a rule, it is the police who apply for commitment and the accused who oppose. Here the positions are reversed. The accused have been fighting strenuously to be committed and the Police have -- opposed them with equal strenuousness at every stage. It should be a matter of complete indifference to the Police by which court the case is tried, and it is difficult to account for their action except on grounds which completely justify the apprehension expressed by petitioners. Apparently they are determined that the case shall be tried by the Sub Divisional Magistrate of Bellary and by no one else.

Petitioners have asked that the case shall be transferred to some Magistrate outside Bellary District. We informed Mr. Ethiraj that, in our opinion, a case of this kind which - raises very grave issues, is one that should be tried by the -- highest court in a district and not by a divisional magistrate. We gave him time to get further instructions and he now informs us that he is instructed not to oppose a commitment. - The only difficulty in the way of our ordering the case to be committed is Wallace J's previous order declining to interfere, but that was passed in a different connection and on other grounds. What the Magistrate has decided was that no offence triable by a Court of Session had been made out. The Sessions Judge held that he could not revise the order as no one had been improperly discharged and with this order Wallace J. declined to interfere. It has always been held by this Court that a Magistrate has quite unlimited power to commit a case to Sessions if he thinks that it is one which "ought to be tried" there - vide section 347 C.P.C. We are strongly of opinion that this is a case which ought to be tried by a Court of Session. It raises very serious issues - from a point of view, both of the Public and of the accused - which should we think be tried by the highest and most independent tribunal available. These are matters which were not -- raised or argued before Wallace J. He was asked to interfere with an order of the Sessions Judge based on a ground which --

does not ~~xixm~~ now arise for consideration. The only question that was considered by the Magistrate was whether an offence - exclusively triable by a Court of Session had been made out. - All we think it necessary to say is that we consider that the case is one that should be tried by the Sessions Court. We - direct under Section 526 (iv) of the C. P. C. that the petitioners be committed for trial to the Court of Session, Bellary.

(sd) P. Kandaswami.

Ag. Deputy Registrar, App. Side.

(True Copy).

Pub. Dept.

Disputes between Panchachara & Vadaga

pp 1–14 cy. CW. 6163 from M.P. Tirr. Rao dy 15.12.25.

Forwarded to the C.S.

This may be sent to the D.M. for remarks.

It is not possible to prohibit any symbols

[illegible] peculiar to [illegible]

[illegible] C.P.R. 16.12.25.

p. 15 cy. [illegible] issued [illegible] to D.M. Bellary,

[illegible] No. 6163 dy 18.12.25.

p. 16 cy. CW. No. 6162 from Tahsildar Ranganatham

[illegible] dy 16.12.25.

Forwarded to the C.S.

[illegible] disputes can be compro-

[illegible] mised, towards to avoid

further Controversies &

bloodshed which may be

very advantageous. This

may be sent to the D.M.

[illegible] C.P.R. 17.12.25.

p. 17 cy. [illegible] issued Endt. no. 6162 dy 17.12.25

pp 18–21 cy. CW. 44 from D.M. no. 5608 dy 21.26.

[illegible]

Para 2 of the D.M's

Report at pp 18–19 cf. summarises the requests in the two petitions. Paras 6–9 of the report state the D.M.'s views on the requests. The D.M. is opposed to granting any of the requests.

Submitted for orders.

5.1.26.

The DM is opposed to the withdrawal of the Prosecution – but would be prepared to consider it if the parties were to give so signal an indication of their change of mind as to allow the Sadar Farm to conduct his journeys through Uitenhage. I do not see myself how, even if this were done, the Prosecution could be dropped. If the parties had merely spoken on another heads it might be worth while to drop the Prosecution if there were indubitable proofs that by so doing all future trouble would be obviated. But here, what actually happened, was a wanton assault on the police before by one of the parties before the two parties were in touch with one another at all. I do not see that this has this assault on the Police can now be wiped out by the professed intentions of the parties to make up their differences & shake hands.

5/1/26.

CS.

I do not think that the prosecutions should be withdrawn

OAll 6.1.26

C1 Although, as rightly remarked by the Ls, this case is complicated by the circumstance that there was a wanton assault on the police, yet if this old feud can be terminated, ~~for~~ and finally & satisfactorily I would be in favour of withdrawal &

But as to this aspect of the case I wholly agree with §7 & 8 of the D.M.'s letter and he may be informed accordingly

If at any time there is a real change of heart and peace ~~is~~ truly in sight, his Dn will, no doubt, move in the matter suo motu

CR
6.1.26

V.J.

A draft memo to the D.M., a draft reply to the petition filed by Mr Siva Rao & a draft reply to the letter addressed by Mr Ranganathan Mudr to H.M.C are submitted.

Siva
7.1.26

Mudr
7/1/26.

C.S.

OAll
7.1.26

P.22 CF [Memo No 6163-2 of 7.1.1926 to D.M., Bellary]
P 23 CF [Memo No 6163-3 of 7.1.1926 to Mr Siva Rao]

Box No 1
C. 6.1.26
R. 6.1.26

PP 1-14 Cf.

P. 16 Cf.

MWL

Pub. Dy.

~~Secy.~~

D.O. No. 6163-4 dy. 7.1.1926.

Dear Sir,

Thangi Rioting Case.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 16th Dec. 25 addressed to the Hon. Sir C.P. Ramaswami Aiyar.

P. 16 cf.

The Govt. understand that the case stands adjourned to the 11th inst. I am to say that they are unable to direct a further adjournment or withdrawal of the case.

Para 10, p. 21 cf.

Secy CS

DESPATCHED
7 JAN 1926

8/1

To Mr. K. Ranganatham
Mudaliyar Asst.
Madras

Devashama
Theosophical Society
Bellary.

(C. No 155.)

From Mr P. Siva Rao dy 6.1.1926.

p 24-25 C.P.

p 24 C.F.

" Forwarded to me.

The C.S may send this on to the D.M. As will appear from my note he has been vested with the discretion to deal with the matter.

C.P.R.
8.1.1926.

p 3 ante

Draft memo to the D.M. is submitted for approval

15/1/26.

11/1/1926.

13.1.26.

p 26 C.P.

Memo No 6163-5 dy 15.1.1926 to D.M. Bellary

~~6~~ 38

C. 3.2-26
Oc. 9
R. 5-2-26

Extract from the Bellary Collector's Fortnightly Report dated 27-1-1926 :-

Grave Crime:- The enquiry into the Uttangi Rioting case is going on. Mr. Ranganadham, M. L. C., saw me at Hospet a few days ago and told me that both the rival sects had composed their differences and that the Panchachars had given him a written undertaki to see the Sadar Procession through.' But I have so far received no representation from either side in the matter.

Before the suggestion to withdraw the case can be accepted, several aspects of the matter have to be considered. If the Sadar procession is to be repeate reinforcements of Police Reserves will have to be - called in from other districts as a safeguard against another possible riot and there is no reason why the cost of these should not be recovered from the parties Again, supposing the Panchachars, to save themselves from the present prosecution, allow the Sadar Guru to go in procession through Uttangi, the Sadar Guru may not rest content with this. He may, after a little while, ask to be allowed to go in procession through Ujjini itself -- the seat of the Panchachar Mutt; and the Panchachars may object to this further move and there would be a recrudescence of the trouble in another quarter. Unless therefore there is a - practical certainty that the withdrawal of the case would once for all end this long standing feud, I would not allowa a withdrawal.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S 4- FEB 1926 GOVT. OF MADRAS

U. S.

Submitted for information.

Copy to C I

C.S. 2/2/26.

Extract from the D.O. letter dated 27th May 1926, from Khan Bahadur Muhammad Bazlullah Sahib Bahadur, C.I.E., O.B.E., Collector of Bellary.

Grave Crime - Uttangi Rioting case

I enclose herewith a copy of the High Court's order directing the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Bellary to commit the accused in the Uttangi Rioting Case for trial to the Court of Sessions. It is a curious order My reports in connection with the riot were departmental ones and were the result of a local investigation held for the specific purpose of ascertaining whether the Police were justified in opening fire to suppress the riot. If the High Court's view indicated in their present order is correct, it practically comes to this, -- that if a District Magistrate in the course of the Criminal administration of his district, expresses an opinion in connection with any occurrence, no Magistrate in the district could be expected to try impartially any case arising out of the said occurrence for fear that his findings might run counter to the view expressed by the District Magistrate, and in every such case, the accused may entertain a bona fide apprehension that he will not have a fair trial in any court subordinate to the District Magistrate. At this rate, the numerous cases in the district which are prosecuted before Sub Divisional and subordinate magistrates with the legal sanction or administrative approval of the District Magistrate must be tried outside the district or committ to the Sessions Court.

I am glad that the committal of the case will relieve the congestion of work that has resulted in the Headquarters Deputy Magistrate's Court from this protracted trial but I regret that the time and trouble so far spent by this Court has been wasted in consequence of the High Court's order, which, I venture to think, cannot be justified on any of the grounds mentioned in Section 156(1) C.C.P. The High Court's remark

that "Government would have done well to reserve their finding on the facts and their eulogies on the officers concerned till the courts had had their say" seem to me to be as uncalled for as their statement that it was on the District Magistrate's report that the officers present at the riot were "warmly commended by Government" is ~~xxx~~ incorrect. A reference to G.O.No. 1090 Public, dated 11-11-1925 will show that the commendation referred to was based on the facts set forth in the report of the District Superintendent of Police who was present at the riot.

Box

Submitted

~~Had this extract taken from the F.R. for this file~~

Dr Remark No action Ext is necessary, I think, to the High Court's remarks about Ext. an hastily justified. The riot occurred on 18th Oct, 1925.

8.6.26

I consider that the High Court has made grossly indiscreet remarks. I do not think that any Govt should ~~xxx~~ pronounce on the achievements of a police officer while a case may be launched later on

8/6/26

41

I would ignore the particular remarks of the High Ct. The Police are not on trial. Govt were perfectly justified in commending the Police for the manner they dealt with the situation & communication of that kind should be prompted by the action of the Bengal Govt in the Calcutta riots & I think Govt were right in saying that the conduct of the police etc. in Bengal stinks. Jeff
9/6/26

Govt. were perfectly Justified in Commending the police. The indiscreet remarks of the High Court should be ignored
Ws.
9/6/26

Agree. As a matter of fact the argument of the High Court would seem to apply to the Sessions Judge himself & the High Court itself! - at least to half of the Bench that passed his order.
Jle
9.6.26

I agree
S.
11-VI-26-

C.S. need this file be kept open longer? Recd all 11.6.26 WS-11.6.

CHIEF SECRETARY
11 JUN 1926
GOVT. OF MADRAS